





Short-term Methods for Estimating the Chronic Toxicity of Effluents and Receiving Waters to Marine and Estuarine Organisms

Third Edition

October 2002



**U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Office of Water (4303T)
1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20460**

EPA-821-R-02-014

DISCLAIMER

The Engineering and Analysis Division, of the Office of Science and Technology, has reviewed and approved this report for publication. Neither the United States Government nor any of its employees, contractors, or their employees make any warranty, expressed or implied, or assumes any legal liability or responsibility for any third party's use of or the results of such use of any information, apparatus, product, or process discussed in this report, or represents that its use by such party would not infringe on privately owned rights.

CONTENTS

	Page
Figures	viii
Tables	xiii
Section Number	Page
1. Introduction	1
2. Short-Term Methods for Estimating Chronic Toxicity	3
Introduction	3
Types of Tests	5
Static Tests	6
Advantages and Disadvantages of Toxicity Test Types	6
3. Health and Safety	7
General Precautions	7
Safety Equipment	7
General Laboratory and Field Operations	7
Disease Prevention	8
Safety Manuals	8
Waste Disposal	8
4. Quality Assurance	9
Introduction	9
Facilities, Equipment, and Test Chambers	9
Test Organisms	9
Laboratory Water Used for Culturing and Test Dilution Water	9
Effluent and Receiving Water Sampling and Handling	10
Test Conditions	10
Quality of Test Organisms	10
Food Quality	11
Acceptability of Chronic Toxicity Tests	11
Analytical Methods	12
Calibration and Standardization	12
Replication and Test Sensitivity	12
Variability in Toxicity Test Results	12
Test Precision	12
Demonstrating Acceptable Laboratory Performance	15
Documenting Ongoing Laboratory Performance	15
Reference Toxicants	16
Record Keeping	18
5. Facilities, Equipment, and Supplies	19
General Requirements	19
Test Chambers	20
Cleaning Test Chambers and Laboratory Apparatus	20
Apparatus and Equipment for Culturing and Toxicity Tests	20
Reagents and Consumable Materials	20
Test Organisms	21
Supplies	21
6. Test Organisms	22
Test Species	22
Sources of Test Organisms	22

CONTENTS (CONTINUED)

Section Number	Page
	23
	23
	24
	24
	25
7. Dilution Water	26
Types of Dilution Water	26
Standard, Synthetic Dilution Water	26
Use of Receiving Water as Dilution Water	28
Use of Tap Water as Dilution Water	29
Dilution Water Holding	30
8. Effluent and Receiving Water Sampling, Sample Handling, and Sample Preparation for Toxicity Tests	31
Effluent Sampling	31
Effluent Sample Types	31
Effluent Sampling Recommendations	32
Receiving Water Sampling	32
Effluent and Receiving Water Sample Handling, Preservation, and Shipping	33
Sample Receiving	34
Persistence of Effluent Toxicity During Sample Shipment and Holding	34
Preparation of Effluent and Receiving Water Samples for Toxicity Tests	34
Preliminary Toxicity Range-finding Tests	38
Multiconcentration (Definitive) Effluent Toxicity Tests	38
Receiving Water Tests	38
9. Chronic Toxicity Test Endpoints and Data Analysis	40
Endpoints	40
Relationship between Endpoints Determined by Hypothesis Testing and Point Estimation Techniques	40
Precision	42
Data Analysis	42
Choice of Analysis	44
Hypothesis Tests	46
Point Estimation Techniques	47
10. Report Preparation and Test Review	49
Report Preparation	49
Test Review	51
11. Test Method: Sheepshead Minnow, <i>Cyprinodon variegatus</i> , Larval Survival and Growth Test Method 1004.0	55
Scope and Application	55
Summary of Method	55
Interferences	55
Safety	57
Apparatus and Equipment	57
Reagents and Consumable Materials	59
Effluent and Receiving Water Collection, Preservation, and Storage	67
Calibration and Standardization	67
Quality Control	67

CONTENTS (CONTINUED)

Section Number	Page
	67
Test Procedures	67
Summary of Test Conditions and Test Acceptability Criteria	76
Acceptability of Test Results	76
Data Analysis	76
Precision and Accuracy	107
12. Test Method: Sheepshead Minnow, <i>Cyprinodon variegatus</i> , Embryo-larval Survival and Teratogenicity Test Method 1005.0	117
Scope and Application	117
Summary of Method	117
Interferences	117
Safety	119
Apparatus and Equipment	119
Reagents and Consumable Materials	121
Effluent and Receiving Water Collection, Preservation, and Storage	130
Calibration and Standardization	130
Quality Control	130
Test Procedures	130
Acceptability of Test Results	136
Summary of Test Conditions and Test Acceptability Criteria	136
Data Analysis	136
Precision and Accuracy	152
13. Test Method: Inland Silverside, <i>Menidia beryllina</i> , Larval Survival and Growth Method 1006.0	155
Scope and Application	155
Summary of Method	155
Interferences	155
Safety	157
Apparatus and Equipment	157
Reagents and Consumable Materials	159
Effluent and Receiving Water Collection, Preservation, and Storage	168
Calibration and Standardization	168
Quality Control	168
Test Procedures	168
Summary of Test Conditions and Test Acceptability Criteria	175
Acceptability of Test Results	175
Data Analysis	175
Precision and Accuracy	205
14. Test Method: Mysid, <i>Mysidopsis bahia</i> , Survival, Growth, and Fecundity Test Method 1007.0	214
Scope and Application	214
Summary of Method	214
Interferences	214
Safety	216
Apparatus and Equipment	216
Reagents and Consumable Materials	217
Effluent and Receiving Water Collection, Preservation, and Storage	226
Calibration and Standardization	226

CONTENTS (CONTINUED)

Section Number	Page

Quality Control	226
Test Procedures	227
Summary of Test Conditions and Test Acceptability Criteria	235
Acceptability of Test Results	235
Data Analysis	236
Precision and Accuracy	285
15. Test Method: Sea Urchin, <i>Arbacia punctulata</i> , Fertilization Test Method 1008.0	293
Scope and Application	293
Summary of Method	293
Interferences	293
Safety	293
Apparatus and Equipment	293
Reagents and Consumable Materials	295
Effluent and Receiving Water Collection, Preservation, and Storage	303
Calibration and Standardization	303
Quality Control	303
Test Procedures	303
Summary of Test Conditions and Test Acceptability Criteria	307
Acceptability of Test Results	307
Data Analysis	309
Precision and Accuracy	325
16. Test Method: Red Macroalga, <i>Champia parvula</i> , Reproduction Test Method 1009.0	332
Scope and Application	332
Summary of Method	332
Interferences	332
Safety	333
Apparatus and Equipment	333
Reagents and Consumable Materials	334
Effluent and Receiving Water Collection, Preservation, and Storage	341
Calibration and Standardization	341
Quality Control	341
Test Procedures	341
Summary of Test Conditions and Test Acceptability Criteria	346
Acceptability of Test Results	346
Data Analysis	346
Precision and Accuracy	361
Cited References	367
Bibliography	376
Appendices	383
A. Independence, Randomization, and Outliers	384
B. Validating Normality and Homogeneity of Variance Assumptions	390
C. Dunnett's Procedure	401
D. T test with Bonferroni's Adjustment	414
E. Steel's Many-one Rank Test	420
F. Wilcoxon Rank Sum Test	425
G. Single Concentration Toxicity Test - Comparison of Control with 100% Effluent or Receiving Water	432

CONTENTS (CONTINUED)

Section Number		Page
H.	Probit Analysis	436
I.	Spearman-Karber Method	439
J.	Trimmed Spearman-Karber Method	444
K.	Graphical Method	448
L.	Linear Interpolation Method	452
Cited References		463

FIGURES

SECTION 1-10

Number		Page
1.	Control charts	17
2.	Flowchart for statistical analysis of test data	45

SECTION 11

Number		Page
1.	Embryonic development of sheepshead minnow, <i>Cyprinodon variegatus</i>	65
2.	Data form for the sheepshead minnow, <i>Cyprinodon variegatus</i> , larval survival and growth test. Daily record of larval survival and test conditions	72
3.	Data form for the sheepshead minnow, <i>Cyprinodon variegatus</i> , larval survival and growth test. Dry weights of larvae	75
4.	Data form for the sheepshead minnow, <i>Cyprinodon variegatus</i> , larval survival and growth test. Summary of test results	77
5.	Flowchart for statistical analysis of the sheepshead minnow, <i>Cyprinodon variegatus</i> , larval survival data by hypothesis testing	81
6.	Flowchart for statistical analysis of the sheepshead minnow, <i>Cyprinodon variegatus</i> , larval survival data by point estimation	82
7.	Plot of mean survival proportion data in Table 5	85
8.	Flowchart for statistical analysis of the sheepshead minnow, <i>Cyprinodon variegatus</i> , larval growth data	92
9.	Plot of weight data from sheepshead minnow, <i>Cyprinodon variegatus</i> , larval survival and growth test	95
10.	Plot of raw data, observed means, and smoothed means for the sheepshead minnow, <i>Cyprinodon variegatus</i> , growth data from Tables 4 and 20	103
11.	ICPIN program output for the IC25	105
12.	ICPIN program output for the IC50	106

FIGURES (CONTINUED)

SECTION 12

Number	Page
1. Data form for sheepshead minnow, <i>Cyprinodon variegatus</i> , embryo-larval survival/teratogenicity test. Daily record of embryo-larval survival/terata and test conditions.	122
2. Embryonic development of sheepshead minnow, <i>Cyprinodon variegatus</i>	134
3. Flowchart for statistical analysis of sheepshead minnow, <i>Cyprinodon variegatus</i> , embryo-larval survival and teratogenicity test. Survival and terata data	140
4. Plot of sheepshead minnow, <i>Cyprinodon variegatus</i> , total mortality data from the embryo-larval test	142
5. Output for USEPA Probit Analysis Program, Version 1.5	151

SECTION 13

Number	Page
1. Glass chamber with sump area	158
2. Inland silverside, <i>Menidia beryllina</i>	167
3. Data form for the inland silverside, <i>Menidia beryllina</i> , larval survival and growth test. Daily record of larval survival and test conditions	172
4. Data form for the inland silverside, <i>Menidia beryllina</i> , larval survival and growth test. Dry weights of larvae	176
5. Data form for the inland silverside, <i>Menidia beryllina</i> , larval survival and growth test. Summary of test results	177
6. Flowchart for statistical analysis of the inland silverside, <i>Menida beryllina</i> , survival data by hypothesis testing	181
7. Flowchart for statistical analysis of the inland silverside, <i>Menida beryllina</i> , survival data by point estimation	182
8. Plot of mean survival proportion of the inland silverside, <i>Menidia beryllina</i> , larvae	183
9. Output for USEPA Probit Analysis Program, Version 1.5	192
10. Flowchart for statistical analysis of the inland silverside, <i>Menidia beryllina</i> , growth data	193
11. Plot of mean weights of inland silverside, <i>Menidia beryllina</i> , larval survival and growth test	195
12. Plot of the raw data, observed means, and smoothed means from Tables 12 and 19	204

FIGURES (CONTINUED)

SECTION 13

Number		Page
13.	ICPIN program output for the IC25	207
14.	ICPIN program output for the IC50	208

SECTION 14

Number		Page
1.	Apparatus (brood chamber) for collection of juvenile mysids, <i>Mysidopsis bahia</i>	225
2.	Data form for the mysid, <i>Mysidopsis bahia</i> , water quality measurements	231
3.	Mature female mysid, <i>Mysidopsis bahia</i> , with eggs in oviducts	232
4.	Mature female mysid, <i>Mysidopsis bahia</i> , with eggs in oviducts and developing embryos in the brood sac	233
5.	Mature male mysid, <i>Mysidopsis bahia</i>	235
6.	Immature mysid, <i>Mysidopsis bahia</i> , (A) lateral view, (B) dorsal view	236
7.	Data form for the mysid, <i>Mysidopsis bahia</i> , survival and fecundity data	237
8.	Data form for the mysid, <i>Mysidopsis bahia</i> , dry weight measurements	239
9.	Flowchart for statistical analysis of mysid, <i>Mysidopsis bahia</i> , survival data by hypothesis testing	245
10.	Flowchart for statistical analysis of mysid, <i>Mysidopsis bahia</i> , survival data by point estimation	246
11.	Plot of survival proportions of mysids, <i>Mysidopsis bahia</i> , at each treatment level	247
12.	Output for USEPA Probit Analyis Program, Version 1.5	254
13.	Flowchart for statistical analysis of mysid, <i>Mysidopsis bahia</i> , growth data	256
14.	Plot of mean growth data for mysid, <i>Mysidopsis bahia</i> , test	257
15.	Plot of raw data, observed means, and smoothed means for the mysid, <i>Mysidopsis bahia</i> , growth data from Tables 13 and 20	266
16.	ICPIN program output for the IC25	268
17.	ICPIN program output for the IC50	269

FIGURES (CONTINUED)

SECTION 14

Number		Page
18.	Flowchart for statistical analysis of mysid, <i>Mysidopsis bahia</i> , fecundity data	270
19.	Proportion of female mysids, <i>Mysidopsis bahia</i> , with eggs	272
20.	Plot of the mean proportion of females mysids, <i>Mysidopsis bahia</i> , with eggs	282
21.	ICPIN program output for the IC25	283
22.	ICPIN program output for the IC50	284

SECTION 15

Number		Page
1.	Data form (1) for fertilization test using sea urchin, <i>Arbacia punctulata</i>	297
2.	Data form (2) for fertilization test using sea urchin, <i>Arbacia punctulata</i>	298
3.	Data form (3) for fertilization test using sea urchin, <i>Arbacia punctulata</i>	299
4.	Flowchart for statistical analysis of sea urchin, <i>Arbacia punctulata</i> , by point estimation	312
5.	Plot of mean percent of fertilized sea urchin, <i>Arbacia punctulata</i> , eggs	313
6.	ICPIN program output for the IC25	323
7.	ICPIN program output for the IC50	324

SECTION 16

Number		Page
1.	Life history of the red macroalga, <i>Champia parvula</i>	338
2.	Apex of branch of female plant, showing sterile hairs and reproductive hairs (trichogynes)	339
3.	A portion of the male thallus showing spermatial sori	340
4.	A magnified portion of a spermatial sorus	340
5.	Apex of a branch on a mature female plant that was exposed to spermatia from a male plant	340
6.	Data form for the red macroalga, <i>Champia parvula</i> , sexual reproduction test. Receiving water summary sheet	342

FIGURES (CONTINUED)

SECTION 16

Number		Page
7.	A mature cystocarp	345
8.	Comparison of a very young branch and an immature cystocarp	345
9.	An aborted cystocarp	345
10.	Data form for the red macroalga, <i>Champia parvula</i> , sexual reproduction test. Cystocarp data sheet	347
11.	Flowchart for statistical analysis of the red macroalga, <i>Champia parvula</i> , data	351
12.	Plot of the number of cystocarps per plant	353
13.	ICPIN program output for the IC25	362
14.	ICPIN program output for the IC50	363

TABLES

SECTION 1- 10

Number		Page
1.	National interlaboratory study of chronic toxicity test precision, 1991: Summary of responses using two reference toxicants	14
2.	National interlaboratory study of chronic toxicity test precision, 2000: Precision of responses using effluent, receiving water, and reference toxicant sample types	14
3.	Preparation of GP2 artificial seawater using reagent grade chemicals	28
4.	Oxygen solubility (mg/L) in water at equilibrium with air at 760 mm Hg	36
5.	Percent unionized NH ₃ in aqueous ammonia solutions: temperature 15-26°C and pH 6.0-8.9	37
6.	Variability criteria (upper and lower PMSD bounds) for sublethal hypothesis testing endpoints submitted under NPDES permits	54

SECTION 11

Number		Page
1.	Reagent grade chemicals used in the preparation of GP2 artificial seawater for the sheepshead minnow, <i>Cyprinodon variegatus</i> , toxicity test	61
2.	Preparation of test solutions at a salinity of 20‰, using 20‰ salinity dilution water prepared from natural seawater, hypersaline brine, or artificial sea salts	69
3.	Summary of test conditions and test acceptability criteria for sheepshead minnow, <i>Cyprinodon variegatus</i> , larval survival and growth test with effluents and receiving waters (Test Method 1004.0)	78
4.	Summary of survival and growth data for sheepshead minnow, <i>Cyprinodon variegatus</i> , larvae exposed to an effluent for seven days	80
5.	Sheepshead minnow, <i>Cyprinodon variegatus</i> , survival data	84
6.	Centered observations for Shapiro-Wilk's example	84
7.	Ordered centered observations for the Shapiro-Wilk's example	86
8.	Coefficients and differences for Shapiro-Wilk's example	87
9.	Assigning ranks to the control and 6.25% effluent concentration for Steel's Many-one Rank Test	88
10.	Table of ranks	88
11.	Rank sums	88

TABLES (CONTINUED)

SECTION 11

Number		Page
12.	Data for example of Spearman-Karber Analysis	90
13.	Sheepshead minnow, <i>Cyprinodon variegatus</i> , growth data	93
14.	Centered observations for Shapiro-Wilk's example	93
15.	Ordered centered observations for Shapiro-Wilk's example	94
16.	Coefficients and differences for Shapiro-Wilk's example	96
17.	ANOVA table	98
18.	ANOVA table for Dunnett's Procedure example	100
19.	Calculated t values	100
20.	Sheepshead minnow, <i>Cyprinodon variegatus</i> , mean growth response after smoothing	102
21.	Single-laboratory precision of the sheepshead minnow, <i>Cyprinodon variegatus</i> , larval survival and growth test performed in FORTY FATHOMS® artificial seawater, using larvae from fish maintained and spawned in FORTY FATHOMS® artificial seawater, using copper (Cu) sulfate as a reference toxicant	109
22.	Single-laboratory precision of the sheepshead minnow, <i>Cyprinodon variegatus</i> , larval survival and growth test performed in FORTY FATHOMS® artificial seawater, using larvae from fish maintained and spawned in FORTY FATHOMS® artificial seawater, using sodium dodecyl sulfate (SDS) as a reference toxicant	110
23.	Single-laboratory precision of the sheepshead minnow, <i>Cyprinodon variegatus</i> , larval survival and growth test performed in natural seawater, using larvae from fish maintained and spawned in natural seawater, using copper (Cu) sulfate as a reference toxicant	111
24.	Single-laboratory precision of the sheepshead minnow, <i>Cyprinodon variegatus</i> , larval survival and growth test performed in natural seawater, using larvae from fish maintained and spawned in natural seawater, using sodium dodecyl sulfate (SDS) as a reference toxicant	112
25.	Single-laboratory precision of the sheepshead minnow, <i>Cyprinodon variegatus</i> , larval survival and growth test performed in FORTY FATHOMS® artificial seawater, using larvae from fish maintained and spawned in FORTY FATHOMS® artificial seawater, and hexavalent chromium as the reference toxicant	113
26.	Comparison of larval survival (LC50) and growth (IC50) values for the sheepshead minnow, <i>Cyprinodon variegatus</i> , exposed to sodium dodecyl sulfate (SDS) and copper (Cu) sulfate in GP2 artificial seawater medium or natural seawater	114

TABLES (CONTINUED)

SECTION 11

Number		Page
27.	Data from interlaboratory study of the sheepshead minnow, <i>Cyprinodon variegatus</i> , larval survival and growth test using an industrial effluent as a reference toxicant	115
28.	Precision of point estimates for various sample types	116
29.	Frequency distribution of hypothesis testing results for various sample types	116

SECTION 12

Number		Page
1.	Preparation of test solutions at a salinity of 20‰, using 20‰ natural or artificial seawater, hypersaline brine, or artificial sea salts	126
2.	Summary of test conditions and test acceptability criteria for the sheepshead minnow, <i>Cyprinodon variegatus</i> , embryo-larval survival and teratogenicity test with effluents and receiving waters (Test Method 1005.0)	137
3.	Sheepshead minnow, <i>Cyprinodon variegatus</i> , embryo-larval total mortality data	141
4	Centered observation for Shapiro-Wilk's example	141
5.	Ordered centered observations for Shapiro-Wilk's example	143
6.	Coefficients and differences for Shapiro-Wilk's example	144
7.	ANOVA table	146
8.	ANOVA table for Dunnett's Procedure example	147
9.	Calculated t values	148
10.	Data for Probit Analysis	150
11.	Single-laboratory precision of the sheepshead minnow, <i>Cyprinodon variegatus</i> , embryo-larval survival and teratogenicity test performed in HW MARINEMIX® artificial seawater, using embryos from fish maintained and spawned in HW MARINEMIX® artificial seawater using copper (Cu) sulfate as reference toxicant	153
12.	Single-laboratory precision of the sheepshead minnow, <i>Cyprinodon variegatus</i> , embryo-larval survival and teratogenicity test performed in HW MARINEMIX® artificial seawater, using embryos from fish maintained and spawned in HW MARINEMIX® artificial seawater using sodium dodecyl sulfate (SDS) as reference toxicant	154

TABLES (CONTINUED)

SECTION 13

Number		Page
1.	Preparation of 3 L saline water from deionized water and a hypersaline brine of 100‰ needed for test solutions at 20‰ salinity	162
2.	Reagent grade chemicals used in the preparation of GP2 artificial seawater for the inland silverside, <i>Menidia beryllina</i> , toxicity test	163
3.	Summary of test conditions and test acceptability criteria for the inland silverside, <i>Menidia beryllina</i> , larval survival and growth test with effluents and receiving waters (Test Method 1006.0)	178
4.	Inland silverside, <i>Menidia beryllina</i> , larval survival data	184
5.	Centered observations for Shapiro-Wilk's example	184
6.	Ordered centered observations for Shapiro-Wilk's example	185
7.	Coefficients and differences for Shapiro-Wilk's example	186
8.	ANOVA table	187
9.	ANOVA table for Dunnett's Procedure example	189
10.	Calculated t values	190
11.	Data for Probit Analysis	191
12.	Inland silverside, <i>Menidia beryllina</i> , growth data	194
13.	Centered observations for Shapiro-Wilk's example	194
14.	Ordered centered observations for Shapiro-Wilk's example	196
15.	Coefficients and differences for Shapiro-Wilk's example	197
16.	ANOVA table	199
17.	ANOVA table for Dunnett's Procedure example	200
18.	Calculated t values	201
19.	Inland silverside mean growth response after smoothing	202
20.	Single-laboratory precision of the inland silverside, <i>Menidia beryllina</i> , survival and growth test performed in natural seawater, using larvae from fish maintained and spawned in natural seawater, and copper (Cu) as a reference toxicant	209

TABLES (CONTINUED)

SECTION 13

Number		Page
21.	Single-laboratory precision of the inland silverside, <i>Menidia beryllina</i> , survival and growth test performed in natural seawater, using larvae from fish maintained and spawned in natural seawater, and sodium dodecyl sulfate (SDS) as a reference toxicant	210
22.	Comparison of the single-laboratory precision of the inland silverside, <i>Menidia beryllina</i> , larval survival (LC50) and growth (IC50) values exposed to sodium dodecyl sulfate (SDS) or copper (Cu) sulfate, in GP2 artificial seawater medium or natural seawater	211
23.	Precision of point estimates for various sample types	212
24.	Frequency distribution of hypothesis testing results for various sample types	213

SECTION 14

Number		Page
1.	Reagent grade chemicals used in the preparation of GP2 artificial seawater for the mysid, <i>Mysidopsis bahia</i> , toxicity test	220
2.	Quantities of effluent, deionized water, and hypersaline brine (100‰) needed to prepare 1800 mL volumes of test solution with a salinity of 20‰	221
3.	Summary of test conditions and test acceptability criteria for the mysid, <i>Mysidopsis bahia</i> , seven day survival, growth, and fecundity test with effluents and receiving waters (Test Method 1007.0)	241
4.	Data for <i>Mysidopsis bahia</i> 7-day survival, growth, and fecundity test	243
5.	Mysid, <i>Mysidopsis bahia</i> , survival data	248
6.	Centered observations for Shapiro-Wilk's example	249
7.	Ordered centered observations for Shapiro-Wilk's example	250
8.	Coefficients and differences for Shapiro-Wilk's example	251
9.	Assigning ranks to the control and 50 ppb concentration level for Steel's Many-one Rank Test	252
10.	Table of ranks	252
11.	Rank sums	253
12.	Data for Probit Analysis	255

TABLES (CONTINUED)

SECTION 14

Number		Page
13.	Mysid, <i>Mysidopsis bahia</i> , growth data	255
14.	Centered observations for Shapiro-Wilk's example	258
15.	Ordered centered observations for Shapiro-Wilk's example	259
16.	Coefficients and differences for Shapiro-Wilk's example	260
17.	ANOVA table	262
18.	ANOVA table for Dunnett's Procedure example	263
19.	Calculated t values	264
20.	Mysid, <i>Mysidopsis bahia</i> , mean growth response after smoothing	265
21.	Mysid, <i>Mysidopsis bahia</i> , fecundity data: Percent females with eggs	273
22.	Centered observations for Shapiro-Wilk's example	273
23.	Ordered centered observations for Shapiro-Wilk's example	274
24.	Coefficients and differences for Shapiro-Wilk's example	275
25.	ANOVA table	276
26.	ANOVA table for the t test with Bonferroni's Adjustment example	278
27.	Calculated t values	279
28.	Mysid, <i>Mysidopsis bahia</i> , mean proportion of females with eggs	280
29.	Single-laboratory precision of the mysid, <i>Mysidopsis bahia</i> , survival, growth, and fecundity test performed in natural seawater, using juveniles from mysids cultured and spawned in natural seawater, and copper (Cu) sulfate as a reference toxicant	286
30.	Single-laboratory precision of the mysid, <i>Mysidopsis bahia</i> , survival, growth, and fecundity test performed in natural seawater, using juveniles from mysids cultured and spawned in natural seawater, and sodium dodecyl sulfate (SDS) as a reference toxicant	287
31.	Comparison of survival (LC50), growth and fecundity (IC50) results from 7-day tests with the mysid, <i>Mysidopsis bahia</i> , using natural seawater (NSW) and artificial seawater (GP2) as dilution water and sodium dodecyl sulfate (SDS) as a reference toxicant	288

TABLES (CONTINUED)

SECTION 14

Number	Page
32. Comparison of survival (LC50), growth and fecundity (IC50) results from 7-day tests with the mysid, <i>Mysidopsis bahia</i> , using natural seawater (NSW) and artificial seawater (GP2) as dilution water and copper (Cu) sulfate as a reference toxicant	289
33. Control results from 7-day survival, growth, and fecundity tests with the mysid, <i>Mysidopsis bahia</i> , using natural seawater and artificial seawater (GP2) as a dilution water	290
34. Precision of point estimates for various sample types	291
35. Frequency distribution of hypothesis testing results for various sample types	292

SECTION 15

Number	Page
1. Preparation of test solutions at a salinity of 30‰ using natural seawater, hypersaline brine, or artificial sea salts	301
2. Reagent grade chemicals used in the preparation of GP2 artificial seawater for the sea urchin, <i>Arbacia punctulata</i> toxicity test	302
3. Summary of test conditions and test acceptability criteria for sea urchin, <i>Arbacia punctulata</i> , fertilization test with effluent and receiving waters (Test Method 1008.0)	308
4. Data from sea urchin, <i>Arbacia punctulata</i> , fertilization test	310
5. Sea urchin, <i>Arbacia punctulata</i> , fertilization data	314
6. Centered observations for Shapiro-Wilk's example	314
7. Ordered centered observations for Shapiro-Wilk's example	315
8. Coefficients and differences for Shapiro-Wilk's example	316
9. ANOVA table	317
10. ANOVA table for Dunnett's Procedure example	319
11. Calculated t values	320
12. Sea urchin, <i>Arbacia punctulata</i> , mean proportion of fertilized eggs	321

TABLES (CONTINUED)

SECTION 15

Number		Page
13.	Single-laboratory precision of the sea urchin, <i>Arbacia punctulata</i> , fertilization test performed in FORTY FATHOMS® artificial seawater, using gametes from adults maintained in FORTYFATHOMS® artificial seawater, or obtained directly from natural sources, and copper (Cu) sulfate as a reference toxicant	326
14.	Single-laboratory precision of the sea urchin, <i>Arbacia punctulata</i> , fertilization test performed in FORTY FATHOMS® artificial seawater, using gametes from adults maintained in FORTY FATHOMS® artificial seawater, or obtained directly from natural sources, and sodium dodecyl sulfate (SDS) as a reference toxicant	327
15.	Single-laboratory precision of the sea urchin, <i>Arbacia punctulata</i> , fertilization test performed in natural seawater, using gametes from adults maintained in natural seawater and copper (Cu) sulfate as a reference toxicant	328
16.	Single-laboratory precision of the sea urchin, <i>Arbacia punctulata</i> , fertilization test performed in natural seawater, using gametes from adults maintained in natural seawater and sodium dodecyl sulfate (SDS) as a reference toxicant	329
17.	Single-laboratory precision of the sea urchin, <i>Arbacia punctulata</i> , fertilization test performed in GP2, using gametes from adults maintained in GP2 artificial seawater and copper (Cu) sulfate and sodium dodecyl sulfate (SDS) as reference toxicants	330
18.	Single-laboratory precision of the sea urchin, <i>Arbacia punctulata</i> , fertilization test performed in natural seawater, using gametes from adults maintained in natural seawater and copper (Cu) sulfate and sodium dodecyl sulfate (SDS) as reference toxicants	331

SECTION 16

Number		Page
1.	Nutrients to be added to natural seawater and to artificial seawater (GP2) described in Table 2	336
2.	Reagent grade chemicals used in the preparation of GP2 artificial seawater for use in conjunction with natural seawater for the red macroalga, <i>Champia parvula</i> , culturing and toxicity testing	337
3.	Summary of test conditions and test acceptability criteria for the red macroalga, <i>Champia parvula</i> , sexual reproduction test with effluents and receiving waters	348
4.	Data from the red macroalga, <i>Champia parvula</i> , effluent toxicity test. Cystocarp counts for individual plants and mean count per test chamber for each effluent concentration	350
5.	Red macroalga, <i>Champia parvula</i> , sexual reproduction data	352
6.	Centered observations for Shapiro-Wilk's example	353

TABLES (CONTINUED)

SECTION 16

Number		Page
7.	Ordered centered observations for Shapiro-Wilk's example	354
8.	Coefficients and differences for Shapiro-Wilk's example	354
9.	ANOVA table	356
10.	ANOVA table for Dunnett's Procedure example	358
11.	Calculated t values	359
12.	Red macroalga, <i>Champia parvula</i> , mean number of cystocarps	360
13.	Single-laboratory precision of the red macroalga, <i>Champia parvula</i> , reproduction test performed in a 50/50 mixture of natural seawater and GP2 artificial seawater, using gametes from adults cultured in natural seawater. The reference toxicant used was copper (Cu) sulfate	364
14.	Single-laboratory precision of the red macroalga, <i>Champia parvula</i> , reproduction test performed in a 50/50 mixture of natural seawater and GP2 artificial seawater, using gametes from adults cultured in natural seawater. The reference toxicant used was sodium dodecyl sulfate (SDS)	365
15.	Single-laboratory precision of the red macroalga, <i>Champia parvula</i> , reproduction test in natural seawater (30‰ salinity). The reference toxicant used was copper (Cu) sulfate	366
16.	Single-laboratory precision of the red macroalga, <i>Champia parvula</i> , reproduction test in natural seawater (30‰ salinity). The reference toxicant used was sodium dodecyl sulfate (SDS)	366

SECTION 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 This manual describes chronic toxicity tests for use in the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permits Program to identify effluents and receiving waters containing toxic materials in chronically toxic concentrations. With the exception of the Red Macroalga, *Champia parvula*, Reproduction Test Method 1009.0, the methods included in this manual are referenced in Table IA, 40 CFR Part 136 regulations and, therefore, constitute approved methods for chronic toxicity tests. They are also suitable for determining the toxicity of specific compounds contained in discharges. The tests may be conducted in a central laboratory or on-site, by the regulatory agency or the permittee. The Red Macroalga, *Champia parvula*, Reproduction Test Method 1009.0 is not listed at 40 CFR Part 136 for nationwide use.

1.2 The data are used for NPDES permits development and to determine compliance with permit toxicity limits. Data can also be used to predict potential acute and chronic toxicity in the receiving water, based on the LC50, NOEC, IC25, or IC50 (see Section 9, Chronic Toxicity Test Endpoints and Data Analysis) and appropriate dilution, application, and persistence factors. The tests are performed as a part of self-monitoring permit requirements, compliance biomonitoring inspections, toxics sampling inspections, and special investigations. Data from chronic toxicity tests performed as part of permit requirements are evaluated during compliance evaluation inspections and performance audit inspections.

1.3 Modifications of these tests are also used in toxicity reduction evaluations and toxicity identification evaluations to identify the toxic components of an effluent, to aid in the development and implementation of toxicity reduction plans, and to compare and control the effectiveness of various treatment technologies for a given type of industry, irrespective of the receiving water (USEPA, 1988c; USEPA, 1989b; USEPA, 1989c; USEPA, 1989d; USEPA, 1989e; USEPA, 1991a; USEPA, 1991b; and USEPA, 1992).

1.4 This methods manual serves as a companion to the acute toxicity test methods for freshwater and marine organisms (USEPA, 2002a), the short-term chronic toxicity test methods for freshwater organisms (USEPA, 2002b), and the manual for evaluation of laboratories performing aquatic toxicity tests (USEPA, 1991c). In 2002, EPA revised previous editions of each of the three methods manuals (USEPA, 1993a; USEPA, 1994a; USEPA, 1994b).

1.5 Guidance for the implementation of toxicity tests in the NPDES program is provided in the Technical Support Document for Water Quality-Based Toxics Control (USEPA, 1991a).

1.6 These marine and estuarine short-term toxicity tests are similar to those developed for the freshwater organisms to evaluate the toxicity of effluents discharged to estuarine and coastal marine waters under the NPDES permit program. Methods are presented in this manual for five species from four phylogenetic groups. Five of the six methods were developed and extensively field tested by Environmental Research Laboratory-Narragansett (ERL-N). The methods vary in duration from one hour and 20 minutes to nine days.

1.7 The five species for which toxicity test methods are provided are: the sheepshead minnow, *Cyprinodon variegatus*; the inland silverside, *Menidia beryllina*; the mysid, *Mysidopsis bahia*; the sea urchin, *Arbacia punctulata*; and the red macroalga, *Champia parvula*.

1.7.1 Four of the methods incorporate the chronic endpoints of growth or reproduction (or both) in addition to lethality. The sheepshead minnow 9-day embryo-larval survival and teratogenicity test incorporates teratogenic effects in addition to lethality. The sea urchin sperm cell test uses fertilization as an endpoint and has the advantage of an extremely short exposure period (1 h and 20 min).

1.8 The validity of the marine/estuarine methods in predicting adverse ecological impacts of toxic discharges was

demonstrated in field studies (USEPA, 1986d).

1.9 The use of any test species or test conditions other than those described in the methods summary tables in this manual shall be subject to application and approval of alternate test procedures under 40 CFR 136.4 and 40 CFR 136.5.

1.10 These methods are restricted to use by or under the supervision of analysts experienced in the use or conduct of aquatic toxicity testing and the interpretation of data from aquatic toxicity testing. Each analyst must demonstrate the ability to generate acceptable test results with these methods using the procedures described in this methods manual.

1.11 The manual was prepared in the established EMSL-Cincinnati format (USEPA, 1983).

SECTION 2

SHORT-TERM METHODS FOR ESTIMATING CHRONIC TOXICITY

2.1 INTRODUCTION

2.1.1 The objective of aquatic toxicity tests with effluents or pure compounds is to estimate the "safe" or "no-effect" concentration of these substances, which is defined as the concentration which will permit normal propagation of fish and other aquatic life in the receiving waters. The endpoints that have been considered in tests to determine the adverse effects of toxicants include death and survival, decreased reproduction and growth, locomotor activity, gill ventilation rate, heart rate, blood chemistry, histopathology, enzyme activity, olfactory function, and terata. Since it is not feasible to detect and/or measure all of these (and other possible) effects of toxic substances on a routine basis, observations in toxicity tests generally have been limited to only a few effects, such as mortality, growth, and reproduction.

2.1.2 Acute lethality is an obvious and easily observed effect which accounts for its wide use in the early period of evaluation of the toxicity of pure compounds and complex effluents. The results of these tests were usually expressed as the concentration lethal to 50% of the test organisms (LC50) over relatively short exposure periods (one-to-four days).

2.1.3 As exposure periods of acute tests were lengthened, the LC50 and lethal threshold concentration were observed to decline for many compounds. By lengthening the tests to include one or more complete life cycles and observing the more subtle effects of the toxicants, such as a reduction in growth and reproduction, more accurate, direct, estimates of the threshold or safe concentration of the toxicant could be obtained. However, laboratory life cycle tests may not accurately estimate the "safe" concentration of toxicants because they are conducted with a limited number of species under highly controlled, steady state conditions, and the results do not include the effects of the stresses to which the organisms would ordinarily be exposed in the natural environment.

2.1.4 An early published account of a full life cycle, fish toxicity test was that of Mount and Stephan (1967). In this study, fathead minnows, *Pimephales promelas*, were exposed to a graded series of pesticide concentrations throughout their life cycle, and the effects of the toxicant on survival, growth, and reproduction were measured and evaluated. This work was soon followed by full life cycle tests using other toxicants and fish species.

2.1.5 McKim (1977) evaluated the data from 56 full life cycle tests, 32 of which used the fathead minnow, *Pimephales promelas*, and concluded that the embryo-larval and early juvenile life stages were the most sensitive stages. He proposed the use of partial life cycle toxicity tests with the early life stages (ELS) of fish to establish water quality criteria.

2.1.6 Macek and Sleight (1977) found that exposure of critical life stages of fish to toxicants provides estimates of chronically safe concentrations remarkably similar to those derived from full life cycle toxicity tests. They reported that "for a great majority of toxicants, the concentration which will not be acutely toxic to the most sensitive life stages is the chronically safe concentration for fish, and that the most sensitive life stages are the embryos and fry." Critical life stage exposure was considered to be exposure of the embryos during most, preferably all, of the embryogenic (incubation) period, and exposure of the fry for 30 days post-hatch for warm water fish with embryogenic periods ranging from one-to-fourteen days, and for 60 days post-hatch for fish with longer embryogenic periods. They concluded that in the majority of cases, the maximum acceptable toxicant concentration (MATC) could be estimated from the results of exposure of the embryos during incubation, and the larvae for 30 days post-hatch.

2.1.7 Because of the high cost of full life-cycle fish toxicity tests and the emerging consensus that the ELS test data usually would be adequate for estimating chronically safe concentrations, there was a rapid shift by aquatic toxicologists to 30- to 90-day ELS toxicity tests for estimating chronically safe concentrations in the late 1970s. In

1980, USEPA adopted the policy that ELS test data could be used in establishing water quality criteria if data from full life-cycle tests were not available (USEPA, 1980a).

2.1.8 Published reports of the results of ELS tests indicate that the relative sensitivity of growth and survival as endpoints may be species dependent, toxicant dependent, or both. Ward and Parrish (1980) examined the literature on ELS tests that used embryos and juveniles of the sheepshead minnow, *Cyprinodon variegatus*, and found that growth was not a statistically sensitive indicator of toxicity in 16 of 18 tests. They suggested that the ELS tests be shortened to 14 days posthatch and that growth be eliminated as an indicator of toxic effects.

2.1.9 In a review of the literature on 173 fish full life-cycle and ELS tests performed to determine the chronically safe concentrations of a wide variety of toxicants, such as metals, pesticides, organics, inorganics, detergents, and complex effluents, Woltering (1984) found that at the lowest effect concentration, significant reductions were observed in fry survival in 57%, fry growth in 36%, and egg hatchability in 19% of the tests. He also found that fry survival and growth were very often equally sensitive, and concluded that the growth response could be deleted from routine application of the ELS tests. The net result would be a significant reduction in the duration and cost of screening tests with no appreciable impact on estimating MATCs for chemical hazard assessments. Benoit et al. (1982), however, found larval growth to be the most significant measure of effect and survival to be equally or less sensitive than growth in early life-stage tests with four organic chemicals.

2.1.10 Efforts to further reduce the length of partial life-cycle toxicity tests for fish without compromising their predictive value have resulted in the development of an eight-day, embryo-larval survival and teratogenicity test for fish and other aquatic vertebrates (USEPA, 1981; Birge et al., 1985), and a seven-day larval survival and growth test (Norberg and Mount, 1985).

2.1.11 The similarity of estimates of chronically safe concentrations of toxicants derived from short-term, embryo-larval survival and teratogenicity tests to those derived from full life-cycle tests has been demonstrated by Birge et al. (1981), Birge and Cassidy (1983), and Birge et al. (1985).

2.1.12 Use of a seven-day, fathead minnow, *Pimephales promelas*, larval survival and growth test was first proposed by Norberg and Mount at the 1983 annual meeting of the Society for Environmental Toxicology and Chemistry (Norberg and Mount, 1983). This test was subsequently used by Mount and associates in field demonstrations at Lima, Ohio (USEPA, 1984), and at many other locations (USEPA, 1985c, USEPA, 1985d; USEPA, 1985e; USEPA, 1986a; USEPA, 1986b; USEPA, 1986c; USEPA, 1986d). Growth was frequently found to be more sensitive than survival in determining the effects of complex effluents.

2.1.13 Norberg and Mount (1985) performed three single toxicant fathead minnow larval growth tests with zinc, copper, and DURSBAN®, using dilution water from Lake Superior. The results were comparable to, and had confidence intervals that overlapped with, chronic values reported in the literature for both ELS and full life-cycle tests.

2.1.14 USEPA (1987b) and USEPA (1987c) adapted the fathead minnow larval growth and survival test for use with the sheepshead minnow and the inland silverside, respectively. When daily renewal 7-day sheepshead minnow larval growth and survival tests and 28-day ELS tests were performed with industrial and municipal effluents, growth was more sensitive than survival in seven out of 12 larval growth and survival tests, equally sensitive in four tests, and less sensitive in only one test. In four cases, the ELS test may have been three to 10 times more sensitive to effluents than the larval growth and survival test. In tests using copper, the No Observable Effect Concentrations (NOECs) were the same for both types of test, and growth was the most sensitive endpoint for both. In a four laboratory comparison, six of seven tests produced identical NOECs for survival and growth (USEPA, 1987a). Data indicate that the inland silverside is at least equally sensitive or more sensitive to effluents and single compounds than the sheepshead minnow, and can be tested over a wider salinity range, 5-30 ‰ (USEPA, 1987a).

2.1.15 Lussier et al. (1985) and USEPA (1987e) determined that survival and growth are often as sensitive as reproduction in 28-day life-cycle tests with the mysid, *Mysidopsis bahia*.

2.1.16 Nacci and Jackim (1985) and USEPA (1987g) compared the results from the sea urchin fertilization test, using organic compounds, with results from acute toxicity tests using the freshwater organisms, fathead minnows, *Pimephales promelas*, and *Daphnia magna*. The test was also compared to acute toxicity tests using Atlantic silverside, *Menidia menidia*, and the mysid, *Mysidopsis bahia*, and five metals. For six of the eight organic compounds, the results of the fertilization test and the acute toxicity test correlated well ($r^2 = 0.85$). However, the results of the fertilization test with the five metals did not correlate well with the results from the acute tests.

2.1.17 USEPA (1987f) evaluated two industrial effluents containing heavy metals, five industrial effluents containing organic chemicals (including dyes and pesticides), and 15 domestic wastewaters using the two-day red macroalga, *Champia parvula*, sexual reproduction test. Nine single compounds were used to compare the effects on sexual reproduction using a two-week exposure and a two-day exposure. For six of the nine compounds tested, the chronic values were the same for both tests.

2.1.18 The use of short-term toxicity tests in the NPDES Program is especially attractive because they provide a more direct estimate of the safe concentrations of effluents in receiving waters than was provided by acute toxicity tests, at an only slightly increased level of effort, compared to the fish full life-cycle chronic and 28-day ELS tests and the 28-day mysid life-cycle test.

2.2 TYPES OF TESTS

2.2.1 The selection of the test type will depend on the NPDES permit requirements, the objectives of the test, the available resources, the requirements of the test organisms, and effluent characteristics such as fluctuations in effluent toxicity.

2.2.2 Effluent chronic toxicity is generally measured using a multi-concentration, or definitive test, consisting of a control and a minimum of five effluent concentrations. The tests are designed to provide dose-response information, expressed as the percent effluent concentration that affects the hatchability, gross morphological abnormalities, survival, growth, and/or reproduction within the prescribed period of time (one hour and 20 minutes to nine days). The results of the tests are expressed in terms of either the highest concentration that has no statistically significant observed effect on those responses when compared to the controls or the estimated concentration that causes a specified percent reduction in responses versus the controls.

2.2.3 Use of pass/fail tests consisting of a single effluent concentration (e.g., the receiving water concentration or RWC) and a control **is not recommended**. If the NPDES permit has a whole effluent toxicity limit for acute toxicity at the RWC, it is prudent to use that permit limit as the midpoint of a series of five effluent concentrations. This will ensure that there is sufficient information on the dose-response relationship. For example, the effluent concentrations utilized in a test may be: (1) 100% effluent, (2) $(RWC + 100)/2$, (3) RWC, (4) $RWC/2$, and (5) $RWC/4$. More specifically, if the RWC = 50%, appropriate effluent concentrations may be 100%, 75%, 50%, 25%, and 12.5%.

2.2.4 Receiving (ambient) water toxicity tests commonly employ two treatments, a control and the undiluted receiving water, but may also consist of a series of receiving water dilutions.

2.2.5 A negative result from a chronic toxicity test does not preclude the presence of toxicity. Also, because of the potential temporal variability in the toxicity of effluents, a negative test result with a particular sample does not preclude the possibility that samples collected at some other time might exhibit chronic toxicity.

2.2.6 The frequency with which chronic toxicity tests are conducted under a given NPDES permit is determined by the regulatory agency on the basis of factors such as the variability and degree of toxicity of the waste, production schedules, and process changes.

2.2.7 Tests recommended for use in this methods manual may be static non-renewal or static renewal. Individual methods specify which static type of test is to be conducted.

2.3 STATIC TESTS

2.3.1 Static non-renewal tests - The test organisms are exposed to the same test solution for the duration of the test.

2.3.2 Static-renewal tests - The test organisms are exposed to a fresh solution of the same concentration of sample every 24 h or other prescribed interval, either by transferring the test organisms from one test chamber to another, or by replacing all or a portion of solution in the test chambers.

2.4 ADVANTAGES AND DISADVANTAGES OF TOXICITY TEST TYPES

2.4.1 STATIC NON-RENEWAL, SHORT-TERM TOXICITY TESTS:

Advantages:

1. Simple and inexpensive
2. Very cost effective in determining compliance with permit conditions.
3. Limited resources (space, manpower, equipment) required; would permit staff to perform many more tests in the same amount of time.
4. Smaller volume of effluent required than for static renewal or flow-through tests.

Disadvantages:

1. Dissolved oxygen (DO) depletion may result from high chemical oxygen demand (COD), biological oxygen demand (BOD), or metabolic wastes.
2. Possible loss of toxicants through volatilization and/or adsorption to the exposure vessels.
3. Generally less sensitive than static renewal because the toxic substances may degrade or be adsorbed, thereby reducing the apparent toxicity. Also, there is less chance of detecting slugs of toxic wastes, or other temporal variations in waste properties.

2.4.2 STATIC RENEWAL, SHORT-TERM TOXICITY TESTS:

Advantages:

1. Reduced possibility of DO depletion from high COD and/or BOD, or ill effects from metabolic wastes from organisms in the test solutions.
2. Reduced possibility of loss of toxicants through volatilization and/or adsorption to the exposure vessels.
3. Test organisms that rapidly deplete energy reserves are fed when the test solutions are renewed, and are maintained in a healthier state.

Disadvantages:

1. Require greater volume of effluent than non-renewal tests.
2. Generally less chance of temporal variations in waste properties.

SECTION 3

HEALTH AND SAFETY

3.1 GENERAL PRECAUTIONS

3.1.1 Each laboratory should develop and maintain an effective health and safety program, requiring an ongoing commitment by the laboratory management and includes: (1) a safety officer with the responsibility and authority to develop and maintain a safety program; (2) the preparation of a formal, written, health and safety plan, which is provided to the laboratory staff; (3) an ongoing training program on laboratory safety; and (4) regularly scheduled, documented, safety inspections.

3.1.2 Collection and use of effluents in toxicity tests may involve significant risks to personal safety and health. Personnel collecting effluent samples and conducting toxicity tests should take all safety precautions necessary for the prevention of bodily injury and illness which might result from ingestion or invasion of infectious agents, inhalation or absorption of corrosive or toxic substances through skin contact, and asphyxiation due to a lack of oxygen or the presence of noxious gases.

3.1.3 Prior to sample collection and laboratory work, personnel should determine that all necessary safety equipment and materials have been obtained and are in good condition.

3.1.4 Guidelines for the handling and disposal of hazardous materials must be strictly followed.

3.2 SAFETY EQUIPMENT

3.2.1 PERSONAL SAFETY GEAR

3.2.1.1 Personnel must use safety equipment, as required, such as rubber aprons, laboratory coats, respirators, gloves, safety glasses, hard hats, and safety shoes. Plastic netting on glass beakers, flasks and other glassware minimizes breakage and subsequent shattering of the glass.

3.2.2 LABORATORY SAFETY EQUIPMENT

3.2.2.1 Each laboratory (including mobile laboratories) should be provided with safety equipment such as first aid kits, fire extinguishers, fire blankets, emergency showers, chemical spill clean-up kits, and eye fountains.

3.2.2.2 Mobile laboratories should be equipped with a telephone to enable personnel to summon help in case of emergency.

3.3 GENERAL LABORATORY AND FIELD OPERATIONS

3.3.1 Work with effluents should be performed in compliance with accepted rules pertaining to the handling of hazardous materials (see safety manuals listed in Section 3, Health and Safety, Subsection 3.5). It is recommended that personnel collecting samples and performing toxicity tests should not work alone.

3.3.2 Because the chemical composition of effluents is usually only poorly known, they should be considered as potential health hazards, and exposure to them should be minimized. Fume and canopy hoods over the toxicity test areas must be used whenever possible.

3.3.3 It is advisable to cleanse exposed parts of the body immediately after collecting effluent samples.

3.3.4 All containers should be adequately labeled to indicate their contents.

3.3.5 Staff should be familiar with safety guidelines on Material Safety Data Sheets for reagents and other chemicals purchased from suppliers. Incompatible materials should not be stored together. Good housekeeping contributes to safety and reliable results.

3.3.6 Strong acids and volatile organic solvents employed in glassware cleaning must be used in a fume hood or under an exhaust canopy over the work area.

3.3.7 Electrical equipment or extension cords not bearing the approval of Underwriter Laboratories must not be used. Ground-fault interrupters must be installed in all "wet" laboratories where electrical equipment is used.

3.3.8 Mobile laboratories should be properly grounded to protect against electrical shock.

3.4 DISEASE PREVENTION

3.4.1 Personnel handling samples which are known or suspected to contain human wastes should be immunized against tetanus, typhoid fever, polio, and hepatitis B.

3.5 SAFETY MANUALS

3.5.1 For further guidance on safe practices when collecting effluent samples and conducting toxicity tests, check with the permittee and consult general safety manuals, including USEPA (1986e), and Walters and Jameson (1984).

3.6 WASTE DISPOSAL

3.6.1 Wastes generated during toxicity testing must be properly handled and disposed of in an appropriate manner. Each testing facility will have its own waste disposal requirements based on local, state and Federal rules and regulations. It is extremely important that these rules and regulations be known, understood, and complied with by all persons responsible for, or otherwise involved in, performing toxicity testing activities. Local fire officials should be notified of any potentially hazardous conditions.